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Abstract

After a brief survey of the problems concerning the traditional way of explaining "genitivus" in Biblical Hebrew, the author offers a possible solution from a syntactic point of view. A verifiable method, called syntactic back-transformation, is used to explain and classify postconstructs or "genitivus". In a syntactic back-transformation, the construct state and postconstruct are converted to an antecedent and relative clause. Subsequently, the relative clause is converted to a principal clause (the kernel sentence). The morphological parts of speech are retained in this transformational process. Syntactic back-transformational rules are formulated by comparing the construct phrase with the kernel sentence. These rules describe from which elements in the kernel the postconstruct and the construct state develop. The following major classes of postconstructs are distinguished in terms of these rules: the noun phrase, postconstruct, noun phrase postconstruct, copula-predicate postconstruct, preposition-verb postconstruct and adjective postconstruct.

In a previous article on the problems of the genitive in Biblical Hebrew (Kroeze 1991:129-143) the traditional way of explaining genitivus was found to be quite problematic. The results can briefly be summarized as follows (with some new examples and references):

1. The expression genitive (and therefore also pregenitive for the word in the construct state - cf. Sawyer 1976:34) can hardly be used for Biblical Hebrew (BH) because it is the name of a surface structure phenomenon, namely that of one of the cases which do not occur in BH (cf. Hoftijzer 1965:2).

2. Neither are the other expressions used consistently, namely construct state, nomen regens and nomen rectum (cf. Sperber 1966:602 and Gesenius 1976: §89a, §128a).

3. The same name is being used for different categories of "genitivus", for example Jouon and Muraoka (1991:466-467) who use the term "objective genitive" not only for cases "in which the first noun indicates an action performed to, for, or against a person indicated by the second noun" (this is in accordance with Gesenius's use of the term (1976: §128h)), but also for "the other objective genitives", namely the genitive of quality, whole, genus, species, material, measure, proper noun and partitive genitive. This use of the name "objective genitive" is unique.

4. The obverse is that different names are being used for the same category, compare subjective genitive (Gesenius 1976: §128g), possessive genitive (Williams 1980:11) and genitive of the possessor, over against genitive of possession (Davidson 1902:31) for a construction. Another example, הָיְתֵךְ, could be classified as a genitive of quality (Jouon & Muraoka 1991:466), an attributive genitive (Williams 1980:11) and a genitive of description (Sawyer 1976:34).

5. Different single categories are distinguished; Jouon and Muraoka (1991:466-467) are the only ones who have a category "genitive of whole" which is not the same as the "partitive genitive".

6. The main classifications are very divergent. Compare for example, Williams's thirteen separate categories (1980:10-12) with Waltke and O'Connor's three main categories plus subcategories (1990:143), which in turn differ from Jouon and Muraoka's three main categories (1991:466-467).

7. Probably the biggest problem is the fact that the levels of morphology, syntax and semantics are mixed up; Waltke and O'Connor (1990:142) give the following examples of semantic labels: "genitive of authorship", "objective genitive", "attributive genitive", "object" being a purely syntactic term.

Jouon and Muraoka (1991:467) confuse morphology and semantics when they say that "the notion of the dative is quite often expressed by the genitive" and give examples where the "genitive" is semantically an advantage or disadvantaged person. Dative is the name of a morphological category (case) used in languages like Latin and Greek, but not in Biblical Hebrew. The "notion of the dative" is not a clear-cut idea, the dative being used differently in Greek and Latin. Consequently, the term dative cannot be used to indicate a semantic class.

Even morphology and syntax are mixed up. Waltke and O'Connor (1990:142, 143) use the morphological terms "adverb" and "adjective" syntactically, putting them on the same level as subject. "We also assign them a grammatical label. A genitive can be analyzed as either a subject (or agent), or as a modifier, either adverbial or adjectival... Three major kinds of construct chain can be distinguished: subjective, ad-verbal, and adjectival." Adverbial genitives" are normally called objective genitives. Jouon and Muraoka (1991:465-470) use "adverb" correctly as a morphological notion: "The construct state is found..."
also before an adverb; for example הניח - these cases could (morphologically) be called adverbial genitives. The corresponding syntactic class is the adjunct.

The separation of these three linguistic levels probably offers the best solution to the problem of the "genitive".

This article offers a possible solution from the field of syntax. It is based on the findings of Kroese (1985). The syntactic methodology and terminology in this exposition follow that of Du Plessis (1982).

In this article the whole construction is called the construct phrase (cp.) (cf. Richter 1979:16: 'Constructus-Verbindung'), the first element is called the construct state (cs.) and the second element the postconstruct (pcs.) on the analogy of Sawyer's 'pregenitive' (1976:34). Other workable expressions/terms are נושע (nasmak - support), נאם (nămik - supported), and עָטֹת (otat - supporter) - compare Jobion & Muraoa 1991:464.

The construct phrases below are categorized according to the underlying syntactic functions of the second element in the phrase and, being in line with the traditional method, this makes the exposition easier to follow.

However, the underlying syntactic function of the first element plays an important part in the sub-classifications. The names of these classes are chosen to follow the traditional method as closely as possible. Although some names do sound semantic, the classes are motivated syntactically as far as possible.

Another example of a syntactic view of construct phrases can be found in Van der Merwe (1992:87-90). He applies the insights of Richter (1980) to the explanation of the functions of construct phrases containing a nominalized verb. He differentiates categories where the second element of a construct phrase relates to the syntactic-semantic function which can be given to the first up to the sixth syntagm and to the circumstantial syntagm in the original, non-reduced sentences. Van der Merwe's "reductions of sentences" are nothing but transformations.

Waitke and O'Connor (1969:141-142, 143-154) also use transformations, converting construct phrases into sentences or phrases to make the underlying syntactic relations more explicit. Based on these transformations, they have three main classes of "genitives", namely subjective, adverbial and adjectival.

Joioun and Muraoa (1991:466-468) give translations for their examples which are transformations (although in English), for example "הanna the love which Y. has", "הרי they who come near me", "הנה the food owed to the governor", "הדי the punishment which you deserve", and "המקס the place where

I must go". However, these transformations are not used to verify the classifications.

The method by which the classes are differentiated and classified in this study can be called syntactic back-transformation. It was developed from the process of syntactic (forward) transformation. The method is based on the acceptance that genitives develop from relative sentences.

In a study of the construct state Steyl (1977:162) found that all construct phrases developed from an antecedent plus a relative clause. According to Steyl the so-called "genitive construction" in the surface structure of Classical Hebrew is generated by the transformational rules which operate on the deep structure of the language. By classification of these rules he found that the relative clause transformation underlies all the uses of the "genitive construction". Nida and Taber (1974:50) also discuss the relative transformation.

Steyl's method is the following (cf., for example, Steyl 1977:126): he starts with the deep structure from which the construct phrases developed. Every construct phrase developed from two kernel sentences in the deep structure. The first kernel sentence contains the word which developed into the construct state. It has the same syntactic function as in the surface structure. The second sentence which developed into the postconstruct (that is, which is embedded as a postconstruct), contains the same word.

The second step is the so-called compulsary relative clause transformation. This step joins the first and second sentence. The second sentence is embedded into the first one as a relative clause. The word that occurs in both the kernel sentences now becomes the antecedent in the first sentence. In the second sentence (now the relative clause) this word is replaced by הָעָשָׂה.

Subsequently the relative sentence is nominalized into a postconstruct. Nominalization is a syntactic process which transforms an embedded sentence in such a way that the grammatical features of a nomin are given to it (Cornil 1974:169). The antecedent becomes the construct state. Steyl calls it the construct state transformation (1977:131, 139) or genitivization (1977:144). Steyl concludes that the construct phrase is optionally used as a syntactic relation to embed a relative sentence in the main clause (1977:150).

The phrase לֹא חָשִׂית (Do not desire another man's wife - Ex 20:17) can be taken as an example to illustrate the whole process (cf. Steyl 1977:135-139). לֹא חָשִׂית is a postconstruct of relationship.

The two kernel sentences in the deep structure are:

לֹא חָשִׂית + אָמַס הָעָשָׂה לֹא)}
This is followed by the compulsory relative clause transformation (embedding):

למד י.xlsx

Finally, the relative clause is nominalized into a postconstruct (genitivalization):

The narrative includes some intermediate steps in the transformational process, some of which are compulsory and others optional, but they are not treated here. If the direction of the transformational process is reversed, the process is called back-transformation.

It is important to note that in another example Steyl (1977:141-145) retains the verbal substantive "commandments" unchanged in the kernel sentences of the deep structure. From a semantic point of view "commandments" is an event, but he retains the morphological class of the word. He does not change it into a verb according to the rules of semantic back-transformation (cf. Nida & Taber 1974:39). Accordingly, this is the most important difference between semantic and syntactic back-transformation. During semantic back-transformation the morphological parts of speech are changed into semantic word classes, but during "syntactic back-transformation" the morphological parts of speech are retained.

The prerequisite then for the use of this method is that neither the construct state nor the postconstruct may be changed morphologically. This has to be applied consistently with all the classes of postconstructs - for example, a verbal substantive may not be transformed into a verb. This guarantees that the syntactic relations between the words are shown explicitly. The moment one allows the word classes to be changed, one enters the field of semantics. If the morphological word classes of the elements of the construct phrase are allowed to be rewritten as semantic ones, the back-transformation of the construct phrases in the same class differs too much, offering no base according to which construct phrases can be categorized (cf. Kroeze 1988:31-36).

Lauwers (1974:157-158) says that a genitive is the result of nominalization and therefore it must be possible to transform it (backwards) into a simple sentence in the surface structure. He goes one step further than Steyl: Steyl (keeping an eye on the context) breaks the construct phrase down into two kernel sentences in the deep structure, but Lauwers focuses on one simple sentence. This sentence is the same as Steyl's second sentence, which will transform into a relative clause and finally into a postconstruct.

When the direction of the transformational process is reversed, the steps are as follows: now the construct phrase in the surface structure is the point of departure; for example, י.xlsx "the king's house" literally, "the house of the king". The second step is an intermediate step: the postconstruct is replaced by a relative clause in apposition to the word that has been in the construct state, which now acts as antecedent: י.xlsx "the house which is to the king". The relative clause in turn developed from the kernel sentence י.xlsx "the house is to the king" in the deep structure. (The relative pronoun is replaced by the antecedent.) This is now the simple sentence in the deep structure from which the postconstruct developed.

To summarize: The postconstruct, being a nominalization of an embedded relative clause, is transformed syntactically backwards into the kernel sentence, which most likely underlies it in the deep structure. This is facilitated by an intermediate transformation, converting the postconstruct (which is an adnominal modifier) into a relative clause.

The exposition below follows the next pattern:

construct phrase
< (developed from) antecedent + underlying relative clause
< kernel sentence (from which the relative clause developed).

This procedure can be called syntactic back-transformation. It is back-transformation because it is the reverse process of transformation, working as it does from the surface structure backwards into the deep structure. It is also syntactic because it does not want to penetrate into the semantic deep structure, where only the meaning of the phrase is important (without consideration of the form). It only tries to find the underlying kernel sentence from which the postconstruct developed or was embedded. Here, indeed, form is important: the morphological word classes are retained. Nominalization (and therefore genitivalization too) is a syntactic process (Cornil 1974:169). Consequently, the reverse process must be a syntactic process as well.

The postconstruct classes are primarily categorized and named according to the syntactic position the word (which has been in the postconstruct) fulfills after the construction is transformed backwards into a kernel sentence.

Back-transformational rules are formulated by comparing the construct phrase with the kernel sentence. These rules postulate the elements in the kernel sentence from which the postconstruct and the construct state developed. All the construct phrases (the back-transformations of which obey the same rules) belong to the same class of postconstructs. These rules can be used to test whether a construct phrase belongs to a certain class or not.
Some classes have the same syntactic back-transformation, but are further differentiated on semantic or morphological grounds after the analogy of traditional differentiations.

The method of syntactic back-transformation thus offers one solution (namely a syntactic one) for the problems listed in the introduction above. It can be used to facilitate and verify the explanation, naming and categorizing of construct phrases. A new classification of the different uses of the postconstruct made on account of the back-transformational rules is given below.

One has to follow the Hebrew idiom, where necessary, to assume elements in the transformation which do not occur in the construct phrase itself. The relevant words have to be checked in the lexicon to determine how these elements behave in full sentences. Sometimes one has to work hypothetically because the grammar and vocabulary of Biblical Hebrew are being reconstructed from a very small corpus of texts.

The participle sometimes acts as a noun, appearing in the construct state and followed by an objective postconstruct (cf. Gesenius 1976 §116g), or by other postconstructs (see below). Gesenius (1976: §128x) classifies these "genitives" as a subdivision of the epexegetical "genitive". He says that the epexegetical genitives are merely formal "genitives" expressing a nearer definition to the construct state. This definition and classification is not valid as all postconstructs express nearer definitions to construct states. All postconstructs are indeed adnominal modifiers. Therefore it will be better to classify the postconstructs after the participle under the different classes of the postconstruct.

When the construct state is a participle, the antecedent as well as the nucleus of the copula-predicate (C-pred) of the relative clause is incorporated in the participle. These examples can be back-transformed by separating the two functions, for example:

- "דרי בן" - (the) descenders of (the) pit (Pr 1:12)
- "בון בן יבשא וגד - they who are descending to (the) pit.
- "בון בן יבשא - they are descending to (the) pit.

With the participle being a kind of adjective, it is not surprising that the same kind of phenomenon occurs when a normal adjective is followed by a postconstruct of specification. Here again the functions of antecedent and copula-predicate of the relative clause must be separated in the intermediate transformation.

The pronominal suffixes with nouns are possessive pronouns (Gesenius 1976: §33c) and are used in the same way as postconstructs. These possessive pronouns can express a subjective or objective postconstruct (cf. Gesenius 1976: §135m). The pronominal suffixes can fulfill the other uses of the postconstruct as well. Only a few examples of this type will be given in this article (cf. Krooez 1988:57-119 and 125-205 for examples.)

The participle as well as the infinitive construct can take a pronominal suffix which can express different postconstruct functions (cf. Gesenius 1976: §61a.h and §115a). Gesenius (1976: §128x,t,u,v) discusses postconstructs after "דרי, יבשא, בון" and their feminine and plural forms separately, without qualifying the use of the postconstruct. He says that such construct phrases are periphrastic expressions for attributive ideas. A common name after one of these words, including "דרי", expresses the possession, quality or condition of a person. It is indeed true that the construct phrase as a whole can express a periphrastic, attributive idea to another noun, but the postconstruct after one of these words can itself be classified, usually as a postconstruct of possession, quality, purpose, contents, or as a noun phrase in postconstruct or a partitive postconstruct.

Periphrastic "genitives" expressed by the preposition "ב" are not treated here (cf. Gesenius 1976: §129). Neither do I treat the wider use of the construct state before prepositions, the waw copulative, "דרי", independent sentences and a word in apposition (cf. Gesenius 1976: §130). Here only cases where two nouns (or substantivized adjectives and adverbs) occur in the phrase are taken into consideration.

The use or omission of the article in the examples below may sound strange, but it should be remembered that often the article is used differently in Hebrew as compared to English and that often the article is omitted in Hebrew for poetic or rhetorical reasons (cf. Gesenius 1976: §126h).

Literal translations are given for most of the examples below because they explain the Hebrew construction better than free or dynamic translations.

A list of the back-transformational rules is given below and at least one example is given with every class.

**SYNTACTIC BACK-TRANSFORMATIONAL RULES FOR CONSTRUCT PHRASES IN BIBLICAL HEBREW**

1. **NOUN PHRASE: POSTCONSTRUCTS**

This group includes construct phrases where the postconstruct is replaced (NP₁ by a noun phrase, etc.) in a back-transformation. The NP₁ is the subject noun phrase. In a
tree diagram this is the nodal point \( NP \), which is directly controlled or dominated by the nodal point \( S \) (sentence) (cf. Du Plessis 1982:36).

### 1.1 Subjective postconstruct

**Postconstruct**  \(<\) **Noun Phrase**\(_1\) (subject)

**Construct State**  \(<\) **Noun Phrase**\(_2\) (direct object - verbal substantive)

**Adjunct** (internal/cognate noun - verbal substantive)

**For example:**

- **בר יד -** the word of Yahweh (Gesenius 1976: §128g)

- **בר יד -** the word that Yahweh spoke

- **בר יד -** Yahweh spoke the word

- **לבת -** (the) pain/hurt of (the) heart (Pr 15:13)

- **לבת -** (the) pain which (the) heart pains with

- **לבת -** (the) heart pains with (the) pain (internal, cognate adjunct)

**Compare**

- **שמחה -** the joy/gladness of him (the heart) (Pr 14:10)

- **שמחה -** the joy which he is joyous with

- **שמחה -** he is joyous with the joy (internal, cognate adjunct)

**Compare Jonah 4:6:** יִרְמָס יֵתָנ...שָׂמִים וּרְלָה

### 1.2 Possession postconstructs

#### 1.2.1 Postconstruct of possession (property)

**Postconstruct**  \(<\) **Noun Phrase**\(_2\) (subject - concrete entity)

**Construct State**  \(<\) **Copula-predicate** (Prep. phrase, \( \lambda \) of possessor)

**For example:**

- **agini חָצִים -** owners of arrows (Gn 49:23 - cf. Gesenius 1976: §128u)

- **agini חָצִים -** owners to whom there are arrows

- **agini חָצִים -** there are arrows to owners (cf. NIV: "archers")

### 1.2.2 Postconstruct of quality (attribute)

**Postconstruct**  \(<\) **Noun Phrase**\(_1\) (subject - abstract noun)

**Construct State**  \(<\) **Copula-predicate** (Prep. phrase, \( \lambda \) of possessor)

**For example:**

- **דָּוִד תמְרוֹפֵּה -** a witness of faithfulness (Pr 14:5 - cf. Gesenius 1976: §128p)

- **דָּוִד תמְרוֹפֵּה -** a witness to whom there is faithfulness

- **דָּוִד תמְרוֹפֵּה -** there is faithfulness to a witness

### 2. NOUN PHRASE\(_2\) POSTCONSTRUCT (OBJECTIVE POSTCONSTRUCT)

This group includes construct phrases where the postconstruct is replaced by a noun phrase\(_2\) in a back-transformation. The \( NP_2 \) is the direct object-noun phrase. This is the nodal point \( NP \) which is directly controlled by the nodal point \( VP \) (verbal phrase) (Du Plessis 1982:36).

**Postconstruct**  \(<\) **Noun Phrase**\(_2\) (object)

**Construct State**  \(<\) **Noun Phrase**\(_2\) (subject)/

**Noun Phrase**\(_2\) (second object)/

**Adjunct** (internal/cognate noun)/

**Copula-predicate**

**For example:**

- **אלִילָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל -** (the) God of the heaven (cf. Gesenius 1976:§ 128a)

- **אלִילָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל -** (the) God who created the heaven

- **ברַי אלִילָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל -** (the) God created the heaven


- **וְיִדוּ -** the favour which He gave him

- **וְיִדוּ -** He gave him the favour

- **כוּבָּה -** the grief of him (his grief) (Pr 12:16)
the grief that someone grieved him with
someone grieved him with the grief
Compare 1 Samuel 1:6 and 1 Kings 15:30.

- (the) lovers of (the) rich (Pr 14:20)
- they who are loving the rich
- they are loving (participle) the rich

3. COPULA-PREDICATE POSTCONSTRUCTS WITH A NOUN PHRASE AS C-PRED

This group includes construct phrases where the postconstruct is replaced in a backtransformation by a noun phrase which forms the copula-predicate. They can also be called predicate postconstructs with a noun as predicate.

3.1 Classifying postconstruct (postconstruct of genus)

Postconstruct  
< Copula-predicate (NP) (Indefinite; the postconstruct has a wider meaning than the construct state)

Construct State  
< Noun Phrase

For example:

- a fool who is a man
- a fool is a man

3.2 Specifying postconstructs

3.2.1 Postconstruct of species

Postconstruct  
< Copula-predicate (NP) (Definite or indefinite; the postconstruct has a more specific meaning than the construct state)

Construct State  
< Noun Phrase

For example:

- offerings which are peace offerings
- offerings are peace offerings

3.2.2 Postconstruct of name

Postconstruct  
< Copula-predicate (NP) (Proper name and consequently always definite)

Construct State  
< Noun Phrase

For example:

- the river of the Euphrates (cf. Gesenius 1976: §128k)
- the river which is the Euphrates
- the river is the Euphrates

4. COPULA-PREDICATE POSTCONSTRUCTS WITH A PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE AS C-PRED

This group includes construct phrases where the postconstruct is replaced in a backtransformation by a prepositional phrase which forms the copula-predicate. They can also be called predicate-postconstructs with a prepositional phrase as predicate, or preposition-replacing predicate postconstructs.

4.1 Possessor postconstructs

4.1.1 Postconstruct of possessor

Postconstruct  
< Copula-predicate (Prep. phrase, of possessor)

Construct State  
< Noun Phrase (concrete entity/thing)

For example:

- the house of the king (cf. Gesenius 1976: §128g)
- the house which is to the king
- the house is to the king

4.1.2 Postconstruct of possessor of limb

Postconstruct  
< Copula-predicate (Prep. phrase, of possessor)

Construct State  < Noun Phrase (concrete entity, limb)

For example:
4.3 Partitive postconstruct

\[ \text{Postconstruct} \times \text{Copula-predicate} \text{ (Prep. phrase, } \text{ל} \text{ of possessor)} \]

\[ \text{Construct State} \times \text{Noun Phrase}_1 \text{ (abstract noun)} \]

For example:

- (the) ears of a fool (Pr 23:9)

\[ \text{Postconstruct} \times \text{Noun Phrase}_1 \text{ (the construct state is a person suggesting a relationship)} \]

4.4 Adverbial postconstructs

4.4.1 Postconstruct of purpose/aim

\[ \text{Postconstruct} \times \text{Copula-predicate} \text{ (Prep. phrase, with } \text{לעביהו or } \text{שא or } \text{לעכ or } \text{לעכ) of purpose/result)} \]

\[ \text{Construct State} \times \text{Noun Phrase}_1 \text{ (abstract noun)} \]

For example:

- the song of the songs (the most beautiful song) (Ct 1:1)

4.4.2 Other adverbial postconstructs

\[ \text{Postconstruct} \times \text{Copula-predicate} \text{ (Prep. phrase, with a preposition which has some kind of adverbial function)} \]

\[ \text{Construct State} \times \text{Noun Phrase}_1 \text{ (abstract noun)} \]

For example:


\[ \text{Postconstruct} \times \text{Copula-predicate} \text{ (Prep. phrase, with an article)} \]

\[ \text{Construct State} \times \text{Noun Phrase}_1 \text{ (abstract noun)} \]

For example:

- water is beside (ןֹלֶע) resting-places

Compare, however, KBL, $3$ s.v. יָשֶׁר : "Rastplatz ... am Wasser"
5. PREPOSITION-VERB POSTCONSTRUCT

This group includes construct phrases where the postconstruct is replaced in a back-transformation by an indispensable, compulsory prepositional phrase, forming part of the nucleus of the verbal phrase.

Postconstruct < Prepositional Phrase in nucleus of Verbal Phrase
Construct State < Noun Phrase/J/Noun Phrase/2/Copula-predicate

For example:
- המלך יִשְׂרָאֵל - the king of Israel (Pr 1:1)
- המלך וּמְאֹד מֵסְרָא - the king who rules over Israel
- המלך וּמְאֹד מֵסְרָא - the king rules over Israel

- השבעת גּוֹר - the oath of (to) Yahweh (1 Kg 2:43 - cf. Gesenius 1976: §128h)
- השבעת גּוֹר - the oath which someone swore to Yahweh
- השבעת גּוֹר - someone swore the oath to Yahweh

- מֹלֶלֶךְ - the mockers/scorners of me (my mockers/scorners) (Ps 102:9 - cf. Gesenius 1976: §116f)
- מֹלֶלֶךְ - they who are mocking/scorning (at) me
- מֹלֶלֶךְ - they are mocking/scorning me

6. ADJUNCTIVE POSTCONSTRUCTS

This group includes construct phrases where the postconstruct is replaced in a back-transformation by an adjunct.

General back-transformational rule:
Postconstruct < Adjunct (Adverb, adverbial noun or Prep. phrase)
Construct State < Noun Phrase/J/Noun Phrase/2/Copula-predicate

6.1 Adverb-replacing adjunctive postconstruct

Postconstruct < Adjunct (Adverb)
Construct State < Noun Phrase/J/Noun Phrase/2/Copula-predicate

For example:
- רָע - a witness who witnesses without cause
- רָע - a witness witnesses without cause

- מִתֵּקָה מְאֹד מֵטָק - a fear (of) suddenly (Pr 3:25)
- מִתֵּקָה מְאֹד מֵטָק - a fear which someone fears suddenly
- מִתֵּקָה מְאֹד מֵטָק - someone fears a fear suddenly

- וְלַמְשָׁר חֲרֵי יְהוָה - enemies (of) by day (Eze 30:16 - cf. Gesenius 1976: §128w)
- וְלַמְשָׁר חֲרֵי יְהוָה - they who became enemies by day
- וְלַמְשָׁר חֲרֵי יְהוָה - they became enemies by day

6.2 Adverbial noun-replacing adjunctive postconstructs

6.2.1 Postconstruct of contents

Postconstruct < Adjunct (adverbial noun of contents)
Construct State < Noun Phrase/1 (subject)

For example:
- מִכְבָּב - a skin (leather bag) of water (Gn 21:14 - cf. Gesenius 1976: §128q)
- מִכְבָּב - a skin which is full of water
- מִכְבָּב - a skin is full of water

6.2.2 Postconstruct of duration

Postconstruct < Adjunct (adverbial noun of duration)
Construct State < Noun Phrase/1

For example:
- בֵּן אָרָךְ - a son who found the life for a year
6.2.5 Postconstruct of direction

Postconstruct  < Adjunct (adverbial noun of manner)
Construct State  < Copula-predicate/Noun Phrase<sub>2</sub> (direct object)

For example:
-(descenders of (the) pit (Pr 1:12)
- they who descend into (the) pit
- they who descend into (the) pit

6.3 Preposition-replacing adjunctive postconstructs (cs. < NP<sub>1</sub>/NP<sub>2</sub>)

6.3.1 Postconstruct of material

Postconstruct  < Adjunct (Prep. phrase, עב)
Construct State  < Noun Phrase<sub>2</sub>

For example:
- a ring of gold (Pr 11:22)
- a ring which someone made of gold
- someone made a ring of gold

6.3.2 Other preposition-replacing adjunctive postconstructs (cs. < NP<sub>1</sub>/NP<sub>2</sub>)

Postconstruct  < Adjunct (Prep. phrase)
Construct State  < Noun Phrase<sub>1</sub>/Noun Phrase<sub>2</sub>

For example:
- the way of (the) life (Pr 5:6)
- the way which leads to (the) life
- (the) way which leads to (the) life

- the rumour of you (Pr 25:10)
- the rumour which someone spreads about you
- someone spreads the rumour about you
6.4 Preposition-replacing adjectival postconstructs (cs. < C-pred)

6.4.1 Postconstruct of cause/reason

**Postconstruct** < Adjunct (Prep. phrase, יָּהַב - an entity which performs an act or causes a state spontaneously)

**Construct State** < Copula-predicate

For example:

- דְּקָשָּׁה יָּהַב - she who is sick on account of love
- דְּקָשָּׁה יָּהַב - she who is sick on account of love

6.4.2 Postconstruct of instrument

**Postconstruct** < Adjunct (Prep. phrase, יָּבֻק - an object that is used by a person to perform an act)

**Construct State** < Copula-predicate

For example:

- בָּשְׁנִים מְאֹדָה - they who are pierced by (the) sword
- בָּשְׁנִים מְאֹדָה - they are pierced by (the) sword

6.4.3 Postconstruct of agent

**Postconstruct** < Adjunct (Prep. phrase, with יָּבֻק or יָּבֻק - an entity which would have been the subject in an active sentence)

**Construct State** < Copula-predicate (passive participle or adjective)

For example:

- כְּנַשְׁפָּה יָּבֻק - the cursed of Yahweh (Pr 22:14)
- כְּנַשְׁפָּה יָּבֻק - he who is cursed by Yahweh
- כְּנַשְׁפָּה יָּבֻק - he is cursed by Yahweh

6.4.4 Postconstruct of respect ("genitivus respectus")

**Postconstruct** < Adjunct (Prep. phrase, יָּבֻק)

**Construct State** < Copula-predicate

For example:

- כְּנַשְׁפָּה יָּבֻק - foolish of lips (Pr 10:8)
- כְּנַשְׁפָּה יָּבֻק - he who is foolish in regard to lips
- כְּנַשְׁפָּה יָּבֻק - he is foolish in regard to lips

6.4.5 Other preposition-replacing adjectival postconstructs (cs. < C-pred)

**Postconstruct** < Adjunct (Prep. phrase)

**Construct State** < Copula-predicate

For example:

- מְאֹדָה יָּבֻק - walkers of perfection (Pr 2:7)
- מְאֹדָה יָּבֻק - they who walk (participle) in perfection
- מְאֹדָה יָּבֻק - they walk in perfection
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